

REMARKS

This application has been amended so as to place it in condition for allowance at the time of the next Official Action.

The Official Action objects to claims 1 and 4 as being informal. Please note that applicant has amended the identified claims in the manner helpfully provided by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are therefore respectfully requested.

The Official Action rejects claims 17 and 18 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended each of the rejected claims to eliminate the bases for this rejection, the reconsideration and withdrawal of which are therefore respectfully requested.

The Official Action rejects claims 1-7 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over KAWADA et al. in view of VERLINDEN et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested for the following reasons:

While the VERLINDEN et al. reference describes a failure stress of the glass, it does not disclose that the glass substrate is wound on a drum within the bending permissible stress as in the present invention. Furthermore, VERLINDEN et al. does not disclose that a radius of curvature of the drum on which the glass substrate is wound is set.

Applicant believes that it is not merely routine experimentation to determine a radius of the drum that does not

cause breakage of the glass substrate when the substrate is wound onto the drum.

In addition, applicant notes that even when the glass substrate is wound onto a drum having a radius of curvature set within a bending permissible stress of the glass substrate, in some cases, even a skilled artisan would improperly wind the glass substrate on the drum, causing breakage of the glass substrate. As one of the causes of the breakage is a local concentrated stress on the glass substrate, the present invention is designed so as to avoid such local concentrated stress on the glass substrate by employing a roller, etc.

For all of these reasons, applicant respectfully suggests that the applied combination of references fails to teach or suggest the full set of features recited by the present claims.

The Official Action rejects the following claims as unpatentable over KAWADA et al. in view of VERLINDEN et al., and further in view of the following identified references: claim 8 further in view of VOGELGESANG et al.; claims 9-11 and 13-15 further in view of YAMANE et al.; and claims 12 and 16 further in view of HAIJIMA et al.

In connection with each obviousness rejection, the Official Action identifies those features for which the further reference is offered. However, in each case, the further reference fails to overcome the shortcomings of the KAWADA et al

and VERLINDEN et al. combination, as detailed above in connection with the first obviousness rejection. Accordingly, for each objection, the combination of references necessarily fails to teach or suggest the full set of features recited by such claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of such rejections are therefore respectfully requested.

In light of the amendments presented above and the arguments offered in support thereof, applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early indication of the same is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions or requires further clarification of any of the above points, the Examiner may contact the undersigned attorney so that this application may continue to be expeditiously advanced.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON


Eric Jensen, Reg. No. 37,855
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

EJ/lk